

## CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Mary Salig	Team: Team # 1	CCRB Case #: 200406214	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 06/27/2004 1:30 PM	Location of Incident: alley way of W.10th Street precinct	Precinct: 06	18 Mo. SOL 12/27/2005	EO SOL 12/27/2005	
Date/Time CV Reported Sun, 06/27/2004 1:53 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Call Processing System	Date/Time Received at CCRB Sun, 06/27/2004 1:53 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. An officer			
2. SGT Gregory Abbott	01129	903312	006 PCT
3. POM Christophe Ohare	22266	898207	006 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Christophe Ohare	Off. Language: PO Christopher Ohare made remarks based upon the sexual orientation of individuals.	
B. An officer	Off. Language: An officer made remarks based upon the sexual orientation of individuals.	

## Synopsis

§ 87(2)(b) filed this complaint on June 27, 2004, shortly after she witnessed PO O'Hare's behavior in the alley next to the 6<sup>th</sup> Precinct. § 87(2)(b) witnessed unidentified officers surrounding PO O'Hare, who mocked participants at the Gay Pride Parade. § 87(2)(b) stated that PO O'Hare was dressed in a "gold pouch-like loincloth" along with a headdress. After discussing this behavior with several other civilians, § 87(2)(b) went to the precinct and stated that she wanted to file a report. SGT Abbott made excuses for the behavior of the officers under his supervision and apologized for their behavior. SGT Abbott further explained that he had requested that the officers contain their behavior to the downstairs locker room of the precinct.

The investigator explained our Mediation process to § 87(2)(b) however, she was indecisive about whether or not she wanted to pursue it. She stated that her intention in filing this complaint was to be assured that the officers receive diversity training. She also expressed that while PO O'Hare was the ringleader of the discourteous actions, a large group of officers stood around "hooting and hollering." In a conversation with Supervising Investigator Graizbord, § 87(2)(b) stated that although she has a good understanding of the investigation and Mediation options available to her, she does not think that either is appropriate for her case. § 87(2)(b) described herself as a caring member and resident of her community who is invested in having sensitive and well-trained officers manning her precinct. She feels that an investigation would be a "too involved and complicated process" and her objective would not necessarily be met. Regarding Mediation, § 87(2)(b) does not think that it would be productive for her individually to meet with any of the officers involved as she feels that the root of her complaint is a systemic problem regarding sensitivity training. SI Graizbord then provided § 87(2)(b) with the name and phone number for PO Duffy, the Community Affairs Officer of the 6<sup>th</sup> Precinct. She also informed § 87(2)(b) that her complaint could not remain open indefinitely while she decided which option to pursue.

§ 87(2)(b) then decided to follow through with a full investigation, but cancelled her interview with the undersigned investigator. She expressed displeasure that the CCRB could not influence the NYPD to require certain MOS to undergo "Diversity Training." § 87(2)(b) refused to withdraw her complaint on the grounds that that wouldn't satisfy her. She mistakenly stated that SI Graizbord told her that the case could be kept open for months. It was explained that the case would not be held open and that she could withdraw her complaint, and request that it be reopened at a later date should she decide to pursue that route. § 87(2)(b) again, refused and remained obstinate that she would contact a lawyer who would, in turn, contact the CCRB.

On August 2, 2004, § 87(2)(b) was contacted at work. A message was left concerning the status of this case, and that it would not be held open past Friday, August 6, 2004, unless she contacted the undersigned investigator with a decision about how she wanted to pursue her complaint. § 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g) A portion has been referred to the Office of the Chief of Department as to further address the officer's behavior.

Investigator:

Date:

Supervisor:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date:

Reviewed by:

Date:

